DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 425 764 JC 980 414

AUTHOR	Livingston, Tab
TITLE	History of California's AB 1725 and Its Major Provisions.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	12p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Affirmative Action; *College Administration; *Community Colleges; Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; Full Time Faculty; Governance; *Organizational Change; Part Time Faculty; *Personnel Policy; Transfer Students; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Assembly Bill 1725 (California 1989); California Community Colleges; Orange Coast College CA

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the history of California's Assembly Bill 1725 (AB 1725) legislation and describes its major provisions. Signed in 1988 by Governor George Deukmejian, AB 1725's focus is to emphasize the new role of California community colleges as postsecondary institutions committed to transferring students, offering remedial courses, and providing vocational training. Other issues addressed by AB 1725 are the shift in power from the legislature back to the local board, and a number of concerns related to faculty and the hiring of personnel. The law stipulates the future role that affirmative action will play in hiring practices, highlighting the goal that the workforce reflect the proportionality of the state's adult population. Another topic is the 75:25 ratio, which refers to the goal that 75% of instruction be taught by full-time instructors and 25% by part-time instructors. The last main provision of AB 1725 is an adjustment to the financing of the college system using a new "program-based funding" procedure. New formulas also were developed to change the way the community colleges would receive funding, with an emphasis placed on local control. (Contains 11 references.) (AS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 425 764

HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA'S AB 1725 AND ITS MAJOR PROVISIONS

Tab Livingston
Mathematics Instructor
Orange Coast College

23746 Bayside Lane
Laguna Niguel, Ca.
(949) 249-8360

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Livingston
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

A paper presented to the ERIC Clearinghouse
for the Community Colleges

JC 980 414

EMPLOYMENT POSITION

The author is a tenure-track mathematics instructor at Orange Coast College. Orange Coast College (OCC), founded in 1947, is a 2-year college located in Costa Mesa, California. It is part of the Coast Community College District which includes Golden West College and Coastline Community College. Orange Coast College serves a multicultural student population of 21,000 students. The mission of OCC is to provide quality programs that lead to associate degrees, occupational certificates, employment opportunities, and the transfer to 4-year institutions.

INTRODUCTION

In 1988, Governor George Deukmejian signed Assembly Bill 1725 (AB 1725) after receiving only one vote of opposition ("FACCC Briefing," 1994, p. 1). According to the California Citizens Commission on Higher Education (CCCHE), it was the "most comprehensive policy and regulatory legislation ever adopted for the community colleges" (Laffoon-Villegas, p. 7). One of its statements of purpose is:

> "to strengthen the capacity of the community colleges to meet the emerging needs of our state, and in particular, to better ensure that all Californians are offered a chance, challenged and taught with imagination and inspiration, offered assistance and counseling, and held to honest standards" (AB 1725, section 1,(1)).

What are the major provisions of this sweeping bill and how has it affected administration of the community college?

THE HISTORY AND MAIN PROVISIONS

Before 1978, the community colleges in California acted as local community schools (Rockwell, pp. 1-2). The students who attended were from the local neighborhood, the funding was derived from local sources, and all officers were elected from the local area. The board had two areas of authority; local taxing and establishing policy that affected the residents of its district. The Donahoe Act of 1961 separated the community colleges from the K-12 districts and legislation in 1967 created a state Board of Governors to create "coherent statewide policy directions for the community colleges" (Rockwell, p.2). The passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 created an atmosphere of increased accountability and and a call for educational quality in the community colleges (Murdock, class handout). Funding intended for the community colleges was now to be acquired statewide and no longer on a local basis (Rockwell, p. 2). This had a big impact on the students of the community colleges as they no longer needed permission to attend a college outside their district, spawning the concept referred to as "freeflow." The decisions that each board made now affected students from their local neighborhood as well as those from other districts. This resulted in the determination of policies for students who did not vote for the board members and did not pay taxes to support the district. As the money was channeled to the state coffers first and then to the districts, the power and authority also shifted to the state. The early 80's saw increased resentment that the legislature was acting as a "super board for the colleges" with little understanding of the local needs of each district (Rockwell, p. 2). The state's power

to set student fees was cited as an example of increased state control. Before Prop 13, fees were determined locally, but after Prop 13, they were established by statute.

The fallout of Prop 13 in the community colleges was extreme. Administrators, faculty and classified staff were laid off, classes were cut and support budgets were greatly curtailed (Rockwell, p. 3). By 1984, the response to the severe budget limitations gave occasion for the joining of the Chief Executive Officers of California Community Colleges, the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan, and the Californians for Community Colleges. The combined efforts of these organizations would lead to the bill which would become AB 1725. In 1987, the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan issued its report titled "Building California's Community Colleges" that had many of the concepts of the bill such as the societal role of the community college, its vocational function, and issues of access (Rockwell, p. 4). Due to the fact that Murdock seems to contradict the name of this report as "The Challenge of Change," I am not quite sure what it is actually entitled (Murdock, p. 1).

What are the main issues addressed by AB 1725? A number of sources in the literature focused on the change in governance. Murdock cites the shift in power from the legislature back to the local board, a reverse from Proposition 13 I might add, as a major provision of the bill (Murdock, p. 1). Indeed, many academic senates view certain provisions of the bill as imposing the concept of "shared governance" on the community colleges, but it was noted in class that this is not stated anywhere in the bill (class notes). The Mission College Academic Senate claims that "the shared governance provisions of AB 1725 have greatly

increased the role of the Academic Senate in the formation of college policy, and [specifies] eleven broad areas in which the Board of Trustees has adopted a policy to rely primarily on the advice of the Academic Senate" ("Welcome back," 1998). The Cabrillo College Academic Senate quotes a number of sections of AB 1725 to bolster its claim that the bill gives the local senates more responsibility and clout in representing the faculty to the administration and governing board of the college ("The Law..."). The section of the bill quoted that bolsters their claim of shared governance the most is "Administrators...(should)...lead, organize, plan and supervise...understand the needs of faculty and the learning process...and value institutional governance based upon a genuine sharing of responsibility with their faculty colleagues" ("The Law..."). Bill Scroggins (1997), President of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, notes that AB 1725 opened the door for shared governance, but points out that it was the revision of Section 53200 to 53204 of Title 5 that strengthened the authority of the academic senate in dealing with the local board (p.1).

With a slight amount of skepticism of the Cabrillo College Academic Senate's paraphrasing of the word "should" in their quote of AB 1725, section 4, (o),(3), I examined the bill. It actually says that any laws and regulations regarding faculty and administrator qualifications, evaluations, hiring, or retention should promote the efforts of the colleges to ensure faculty and administration consist of "Administrators who can lead, organize, plan, and supervise; who understand the needs of faculty and the learning process; and who value institutional governance based upon a genuine sharing of responsibility with faculty colleagues" (AB 1725, section 4, (o),(3)). Thus paraphrasing "who can" with

the word "should" does not appear to alter the meaning or intent of the statement. I do however disagree with the occasional statement from administrators that the bill does not stipulate the concept of "shared governance." (class notes). I see "Administrators who...value institutional **governance** based upon a genuine **sharing** of..." as espousing shared governance. However, if the point is the bill does not specifically state the term "shared-governance," then I concur.

The mission of the community college was defined in the bill and transfer is listed as the top priority (Murdock, p. 1). The bill stipulates that the University of California and the California State University system must work closely with the community college system to establish a common core of classes which students can transfer. Thus administrators from both levels need to collaborate to ensure this element of the bill is addressed and met.

The role of vocational education was also addressed as a top priority (Murdock, p.1). Given the large number of students in vocational training at the community colleges, it is not surprising that this was considered an important topic to address. The Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC) considers community colleges to be "California's job training ground" with an enrollment of more than one million students in vocational education courses ("FACCC Briefing," 1994, p. 1). The intent of this provision was to "streamline the flow of vocational students from high schools into community college programs" (Murdock, p. 1). From an administration standpoint, working closely with the high schools to ensure a smooth transition from one level to the next would need to be a primary focal point.

The third major concern addressed in AB 1725 was a new emphasis in remediation (Murdock, p. 1). Murdock equates this need with the changing demographics of the state. An increase in the demand for English as a second language courses and the lack of basic skills of many students, due to demographic changes, are cited as areas that will greatly impact the role of the community college system (Murdock, p.1). Though remedial coursework is an important focus of the bill, it restricts the total number of semester hours to thirty (Rockwell, p. 4). This mandates that it will be incumbent upon administration to offer a diverse and varied curriculum.

AB 1725 addresses a number of issues that relate to faculty and the hiring of personnel. The law stipulates the future role that affirmative action will play in hiring practices. The governing board is admonished to adhere to an affirmative action program that "shall have goals that ensure participation in, and commitment to, the program by district personal, and timetables for its implementation" (AB 1725, section 23, 87102. (a)). It goes on to say that the board of governors "shall prescribe those conditions necessary to assure reasonable progress and otherwise meet the legal requirements of affirmative action. The conditions may include the withholding of allowances made pursuant to Sections 87482.6 and 87107" (AB 1725, section 24, 87104. (a)). Murdock mentions that AB 1725 requires the workforce to reflect the proportionality of the state's adult population by 2005, but upon review of the law, this appears to be incorrect (Murdock, p. 2). The law actually calls this a goal, not a requirement. Section 25, 87107. (a), referring to the Faculty and Staff Diversity Fund, states that "the money in the fund shall be available to the board of governors upon appropriation by the

Legislature for the purpose of enabling the California Community Colleges as a system to address the **goal** that by the year 2005 the system's work force will reflect proportionately the adult population of the state" (AB 1725). Administration can play a major role in meeting these goals due to the fact that presidents have a significant impact on faculty selection. For example, at OCC the hiring committee sends its top candidates to the president for final selection. The president then chooses the candidate(s) that will be hired. From this perspective, the president can have a significant impact on meeting the affirmative action goals of AB 1725.

The hot topic that was addressed in much of the literature was the 75:25 ratio. Many sources discussed the goal that seventy-five percent of instruction be taught by full-time instructors and twenty-five percent may be taught by part-time faculty. However, according to the California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL), this ratio only applied to the instruction of credit courses and not to the instruction of non-credit courses such as ESL classes ("CATESOL position," 1997). Examination of the bill verifies this complaint. Section 35, 87482.6 (a) states that "the Legislature wishes to recognize and make efforts to address longstanding policy of the board of governors that at least 75 percent of the hours of credit instruction in the California Community Colleges, as a system, should be taught by full-time instructors" (AB 1725). It would appear that this is sending a mixed signal to the community college system. The bill addressed the negative impact of too much instruction by part-time faculty and it emphasized the need for remedial and ESL classes, yet it exempted the ESL classes from the 75:25 ratio. From an administration standpoint, this must

seem paradoxical. There have been attempts to include more areas than just the instruction of credit courses into the 75:25 ratios. For instance, the FACCC mentioned that the CCC Board of Governors was likely to support the addition of counselors and librarians to the full-time percentage calculations in 1997, but I was unable to locate whether this had indeed passed (Rilke, 1997). Another faculty-related issue was the intended separation of the community colleges from the "K-12 mentality" resulting in "higher education with an atmosphere of true academia" according to the California Teachers Association (Landre, 1998). The elimination of the state level teaching credential, like that of the K-12 system, was to be eliminated by July 1, 1990 (Murdock, p. 2). For better or worse, this would allow administration and hiring committees to employ professionals from their respective fields without the necessary teaching credential. This has the benefit of adding faculty from industry, but it is my opinion that these very people may not be effective instructors when it comes to communicating their knowledge to students. They would most certainly lack an understanding of educational pedagogy or the institutional culture of public education.

The last main provision of AB 1725 was an adjustment in the financing of the system. Instead of using the K-12 derivative of average daily attendance, financing would be derived by "program based funding," a new formula using credit student FTE head count, square footage of owned and/or leased property, and a percentage of fixed overhead such as administrative costs (Murdock, p. 6). The goal of this new formula was to "bring greater rationality and predictability to the funding process" by shifting the responsibility from the state to the local level (p. 2).

AB 1725 was a comprehensive bill that included sweeping reform for the community college system. The primary focus of the bill was to emphasize the new role of the California community colleges as post-secondary institutions with a focus on the transfer of students and the offering of remedial courses and vocational training. A number of other issues were addressed, such as providing a renewed perspective on governance, externally as well as internally. Externally, the bill shifted power back to the local districts, and internally, it clarified the structure of power and admonished administrators and faculty to share the responsibilities of governance in the organization. Affirmative action issues were addressed with a commitment for personnel to reflect the ethnicity of the state. Growing concern that a large number of classes were being taught by part-time faculty led to guidelines in the percentages of part-time verses full-time faculty. And finally, new formulas were developed to change the way the community colleges would receive their funding with an emphasis placed on local control.

REFERENCES

AB 1725. Available at the Orange Coast College Library.

CATESOL position statement on the need to increase full-time, permanent teaching staff in adult or community college noncredit ESL programs. (1997). [On-Line]. Available: http:www.catesol.org/ftime.html.

FACCC briefing paper for legislators. (1994). [On-line]. Available: http:www.faccc.org/briefing.htm.

Laffoon-Villegas, R. A brief primer on higher education governance in California. [On-line]. Available: http://www.ccche.org/governance.html.

Landre, D. (1998). Unshared governance? Higher Education. [On-Line]. Available: http://www.cta.org/higher-ed/cca-index.html.

Murdock, A. (class handout) Reform for the California Community Colleges.

Rilke, R. (1997, October 14). FACCC victory tops 1997 legislative results. [On-Line]. Available: http://www.faccc.org/infaccc/oct14-97.htm.

Rockwell, R. A brief primer on AB1725 and California community college finance and governance. [On-line]. Available: http:www.ccche.org/AB1725.html.

Scroggins, B., (1997). Establishment of curriculum committees. Consultation Digest. [On-line]. Available: http://www.cccco.edu/cccco/consult/curcomm2.htm.

The law- AB 1725 and Title 5. [On-line]. Available: http://www.cabrillo.cc.ca.us/facsenate/1HELAW.html.

Welcome back to fall semester 1998. [On-line]. Available: http://www.wvmccd.cc.ca.us/mc/senate/default.html.